



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Iphigenie (2174 lines) only twenty-seven, but in *Torquato Tasso* (3453 lines) there are forty-six, while *Faust, Part II* (7498 lines), is richest of all with one hundred and thirty-nine examples. *Götz von Berlichingen* shows an increasing number in its successive editions, as noted before (cp. also *Zeitschrift für deutsche Sprache*, x, 179 ff.). As to the larger prose works, we find, after taking into account the difference in size, that the *Wanderjahre* and the *Wahlverwandtschaften* stand at the head of the list in richness in alliteration.

The results of Ebrard's studies may be summed up as follows: (1) Goethe enriched and extended in all directions alliteration in the German language; (2) From the year 1770 on through the whole period of his literary activity he employed alliteration with increasing frequency; (3) While alliteration appears in all the different kinds of Goethe's writings, it was in his prose works that he used it most extensively, and it is here that we find the great majority of his original alliterative expressions.

To some scholars much of this investigation may seem unimportant if not useless, yet it shows the great richness and flexibility of Goethe's language, and the book is therefore a valuable supplement to Lehmann's *Goethe's Sprache und ihr Geist*. In addition, alliteration is a subject that deserves more attention than it has received. I am sure that if one will work his way through this mass of material and study the passages cited, one will have a better conception of the nature, the beauty, and the charm of alliteration, when handled by an author with a sense of form and an appreciation of music and melody.

CHARLES BUNDY WILSON.

THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA.

Goethe's Egmont. Edited with Introduction and Notes, by Robert Walter Deering, Ph. D. Henry Holt & Co., N. Y., 1903.

The chief points of dispute in connection with an edition of *Egmont* are apt to be the same that were raised on the first appearance of the drama: the extent to which the conventional canons of the tragedy are observed or neglected, the propriety or impropriety

of the alteration in Egmont's character and domestic relations, and other like questions. And the dispute on these points is likely to resolve itself finally into a dispute over tastes, regarding which we have been warned from of old. Nevertheless, so worthy an edition as Dr. Deering's, from the point of view of the needs of the college student, deserves more attention than the simple mark of approval.

The introduction to a foreign text has become largely an essay on the author and the particular work, having little or no interest for the common student, at least until after he has finished reading the text. Aside from the historical account of the way in which the piece arose and the portrayal of the historical situation, if such be involved, the introduction comprises analyses of the action and the characters, a discussion of the technical artistic principles involved and an estimate of the significance and value of the whole. All of these latter points appeal much more to the adept than to the beginner. Yet this fact does not militate against introductions thus constructed, for it should be understood that much of the editorial work is directly for the benefit of the teacher rather than of the pupil.

There is quite general consent to the proposition that Goethe was not preëminent as a playwright. Dr. Deering, however, thinks he discovers quite an extraordinary system and symmetry in the arrangement of the scenes of *Egmont*. But does it not seem highly improbable that Goethe should have planned that scenes 1, 2 and 3 of act II should correspond seriatim, as effects, to scenes 1, 2, and 3 of act I, as causes, even though this relation may in fact exist? Or does it seem like Goethe, especially in earlier years, to have planned so that the first scenes of the successive acts should depict the popular view of a situation, and the second scenes of these acts the view held by the rulers? Unity of theme and coherent thought about it produce inevitably a certain amount of symmetry ; is there really warrant for finding deliberate artistic theory at the bottom of such symmetry as *Egmont* shows?

Certainly no one should undertake to edit a piece of literature who is not on the whole in sympathy with it. But this reasonable demand does not require the editor to assume his author to be infallible. Dr. Deering seems to me to come too near to this latter standpoint. Whether from indifference or inability, Goethe was a poor playwright. Why, then, claim for him an observance of the

three unities, especially since we have long ago ceased to regard this observance as essential to a good tragedy? The unity of place is observed, says Dr. Deering, since "the scene changes only so often as the action demands." Whoever could want the scene to change more frequently? The unity of place, if it means anything, requires the selection or construction of an action that will not demand change of scene. No less generously does our editor deal with the restrictions of the unity of time: "Events are condensed into the shortest possible time consistent with what must happen within that time. Act I occupies two days with several days between scenes 1 and 2; after an interval of several days II and III fall on one day; after some weeks the scenes of IV follow on two days, separated by a day or so; V follows a few hours after IV and occupies two days, with one day between scenes 2 and 3. Egmont is then executed on the morning of the third day." If these are the unities of time and place, what a deal of logical and rhetorical contortion the French classical writers and critics might have spared themselves!

Egmont, as portrayed by Goethe, is not an unusual type, and was still less unusual in Europe in the eighteenth century and earlier. It seems to me that a deal too much effort is expended in the attempt to make him out admirable. We admire individuals of this type quite easily enough. Beauty of person, a joyous disposition, a desire to please if not at the expense of his own comfort, talents of manner, speech and art,—the man with these qualifications wins on sight, and often holds our liking after we have come to recognize him as arrogant, selfish and licentious. No doubt Goethe hoodwinked others and perhaps himself with his talk of 'das Dämonische.' It is a fearsome word, 'wobei sich allerlei denken lässt.' But go to the heart of the matter. Blow away the hocus-pocus, and what is left? About every human being there is, indeed, enough of mystery. But not enough to change our unalterable conviction that every man is responsible for his own acts. No man, not even a Goethe, can relieve himself of his responsibilities to society by pleading an irresistible somewhat that impels him. Egmont did not plead it. He simply preferred to live as he did, and he went to his death, in considerable measure, as the fool goeth. I am not greatly concerned with the question of Goethe's right to alter the character of a great historical personage,

though if liberties are to be taken I should rather idealize than libel. The more important question is, What sort of man have we in Egmont, and how are we to look at him? And here, I hold, we must judge the man on the mimic stage of life quite as we should judge him off the stage. We should undoubtedly admire this Egmont, and be sorry for him in his fate, which rouses unquestionably the Aristotelian 'dread and sympathetic fellow-feeling.' But we should not trust him, because we see that he lives wholly for his own pleasure and he lacks good judgment.

Again, it is going far to claim for Egmont a 'tragic conflict' in the technical sense of the word. Egmont experiences no conflict in his own soul. There is, indeed, a conflict, and it ends in tragedy. But it is the conflict of a man who runs headlong into a stone wall.

As to Klärchen, I regret that I cannot accept the assurances of various editors regarding her innocence and chastity. A man like Egmont does not seek the society of a seamstress or cook with virtuous intent. We may say and think ever so many kind things regarding the loveliness and unselfishness of the girl who is led astray by such a man,—and Klärchen deserves them all—but even without her own tacit admission (act III, second scene toward end) or the explicit assertion of her mother (I, 3), or the implication of Egmont (V, 4 near end), we must accept, as we should in life, the evidence that convinces the neighbors and the town, that she has violated one of the great social sanctities and has forfeited one virtue, however many others she may retain. It is unpleasant to have to insist on such a charge so long as virtue finds a defender, but I cannot help feeling that this defense is prompted more by pity and inclination than by conviction. I do not deny to such a woman pity, but I do not like to read of her as "the ideal of woman's self-forgetting, self-sacrificing devotion, the only woman an Egmont could love, the embodiment of the love the youthful Goethe sought for himself" (XLVII).

After claiming, as it seems to me, too much for the intentions and the achievements of his author, Dr. Deering concludes with a very fair summary (LXXI): "While *Egmont* may not be tragic in the orthodox sense of the word as used by Schiller, Lessing and Freytag, yet, as Schiller admits, it moves us as a tragedy should—which shows that Goethe considered the canons of tragedy too

narrow and thought it possible to write a drama that is in the highest sense tragic without conflict and guilt of the usual type. . . . The average reader misses the external action and the hero 'that does things,' that is at war with himself, or that forces an evident conflict with his enemies; the subtle psychology, the demoniac nature, the mysterious elements of destiny, in which lie the real charm and power of the play, are not clear and tangible, and hence do not make good the loss."

The outline of the historical background is excellent, as are the text and the Notes. Among the latter I question only a few. L. 30, p. 7: Und je mehr man das Ding rüttelt and schüttelt desto trüber wird's, explaining this as derived from 'a powder in solution.' This is quite unnecessary. Is it not more plausibly the thought of stirring up the lees in a flask of wine? On 13, 10, explains a confusion of *dein* and *Euer*, both used by Margaret to Machiavell in one and the same speech, as due to the fact that the latter is at once friend and courtier. It can be shown by II, 2 and III, 2, as well as by almost any play of the classical period, that *du* and *ihr* were confused constantly, not interchanged with design. On 60, 28, is not 1450 a year or two too early for the date of the first newspapers (Zeitungen)? I do not blench at a good bit of slang, but to render Ich wäre des Todes, "I would be a goner" (63, 25), seems to me unprovoked. The note on sein Tage, 64, 26, is not adequate, and is a trifle misleading. "Is also used irrespective of person" implies that this characteristic is valid in our day. In German, modern or middle high, it is apparently limited to sein Tage, seiner Zeit. Even in these cases Germans from early times have hesitated about *sein* if the antecedent or subject was other than masculine or neuter singular. Doubtless the use of *sein* is a relic of the time, when there was but this one possessive for the third person of all genders, but its intrusion upon first and second persons could occur only when the phrases in question had become wholly set and as it were fossilized. The note should also refer to Egmont 1, 3 and 10, 14.

W. H. CARRUTH.

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS.
